

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/071,992	02/08/2002	Siegfried Mailaender	US 20 01 1067	2010
7	590 09/10/2004		EXAMINER	
Paul D. Greeley, Esq.			LEE, HWA S	
Ohlandt, Greel	ey, Ruggiero & Perle, I	J.L.P.	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
One Landmark Square			2877	
Stamford, CT	06901-2682		DATE MAILED: 09/10/200-	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u> </u>			<u> IIn</u>
g	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/071,992 MAILAENDER ET A			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andrew Hwa S. Lee	2877	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence addr	ess
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a r - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state that the period for reply will, by state that the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thirt od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this commander (35 U.S.C. § 133).	munication.
Status			
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on R(2) 2a)□ This action is FINAL.	his action is non-final. vance except for formal matt	·	nerits is
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examination The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) and a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct of the oath or declaration is objected to by the	ccepted or b) objected to he drawing(s) be held in abeyar rection is required if the drawing	ice. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR	• •
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for forei a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a light	ents have been received. ents have been received in A riority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Si	tage
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-1 ·	52)

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dakin et al (US 6,490,045) in view of Hung.

As for claim 1, Dakin et al (Dakin hereinafter) shows a fiber optic sensor comprising: a fiber connection (80, 110) to a DUT (90,100)

an optical circuit (for example 10-80) for providing an optical signal via said optical fiber to the DUT (90,100);

a shielding unit for holding the optical circuit and for providing at least a partial shielding of the optical circuit against mechanical noise (160).

As for claims 2-6, Dakin does not expressly show the details of the vibration isolating housing, however Hung shows that it is known in the prior art of using heavy damped tables and at the time of the invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have utilized a heavy damped table in order to isolate the interferometer form external vibrations (column 2, lines 1-5). Although Hung teaches that a heavy damped table is not necessary, one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to do so in order to further isolate the optical circuit from vibration thus further improving signal quality.

Application/Control Number: 10/071,992 Page 3

Art Unit: 2877

As for claims 7, 12, 13, and 16, Solomon shows the use of additional damping devices and materials and at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to place an additional damping device between the optical circuit and the shielding unit as it would have been well within the skill level of a skilled artisan to use various damping materials in different shapes, including rubber sheets, or other damping devices in between the shielding unit and the optical circuit in order to further isolate the interferometer from any vibration passing through the heavy damped table.

As for claim 8, the optical circuit is an interferometer.

As for claims 9-11 and 17, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a receiving device into order to hold the sensing fiber in the interferometer.

As for claim 14, the components of the interferometer provide substantially no vibration.

As for **claim 15**, Dakin shows all element as claimed in claim 1 in addition to:

an optical signal source (10) and

an optical receiver (150).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Hwa S. Lee whose telephone number is 571-272-2419. The examiner can normally be reached on Tue-Fr.

Page 4

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory J. Toatley Jr. can be reached on 571-272-2800 ext 77. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Andrew H. S. Lee Art Unit 2877